

## IRRIGATION AND POWER DEPARTMENT

The 25th February, 1986

No. 2659.—Whereas the Governor of Haryana is satisfied that the land specified below is needed urgently by the Government, at public expense, for a public purpose i. e., for constructing extension of Kutiana Distributary from R. D. 83542 to R. D. 84542 in village Jamal, tehsil and district Sirsa for which a notification has been issued under, section 4 and published,—vide Haryana Government Irrigation and Power Department Notification No. 692, dated 16th January, 1986, in Haryana Government Gazette Part I, it is hereby declared that the land described in the specification below is required urgently, for the above purpose.

This declaration is made under the provisions of section 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, for information to all whom it may concern.

And whereas the Governor of Haryana is further of the opinion that the purpose for which the land is required is of an urgent nature importance within the meaning of clause (c) of sub-section (2) of section 17 of the said act.

Therefore, it is hereby directed under sub-section (4) of section 17 of the said act that the provisions of section 5-A of the said act shall not apply in regard to this acquisition.

Plans of the land may be inspected in the office of the Land Acquisition Collector Irrigation Department Ambala and Xen, Bhatu Division, Fatehabad.

## SPECIFICATIONS

Serial No	District	Tehsil	Village	Area in acres	Hadbast No.	Boundary	Khasra No.	Killa No.
1.	Sirsa	Sirsa	Jamal	2.08	36	A strip of land varying in width lying from east to west as demarcated at site and shown on index plan.	294 295	11, 12, 19, 20 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20

By order of Governor of Haryana.

(Sd) . . . .

Superintending Engineer,  
Sirsa Bhakra Canal Circle, Sirsa.

## LABOUR DEPARTMENT

The 18th March, 1985

No. 9/7/86-Lab./2452.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Shree Ram Synthetic Fabrics, Industrial Area, Bahadurgarh.

BEFORE SHRI B. P. JINDAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, ROHTAK

Reference No. 150 of 85

between

SHRI GIRJA SHANKAR, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S SHREE RAM  
SYNTHETIC FABRICS, INDUSTRIAL AREA, BAHADURGARH

None, for the workman.

Shri M M Kaushal, A R, for the management.

## AWARD

1. In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the workman Shri Girja Shankar and the management of M/s. Shree Ram Synthetic Fabrics, Industrial Area, Bahadurgarh, to this Court, for adjudication,—vide *Haryana Government Gazette* Notification No. 36185—90, dated 4th September, 1985:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Girja Shankar, is justified and in order? If not to what relief is he entitled?

2. After receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared. The case of the petitioner is that he was employed with the respondent as a worker for the last about nine months and that his services were terminated by the management on 19th April, 1985, in flagrant disregard of the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

3. In the reply filed by the respondent, the claim of the workman has been controverted in toto. The refrain of the reply is that the petitioner was not appointed as worker in the respondent company and as such, there is no relationship of master and servant between the parties.

4. Before any issues could be framed, the parties sought adjournment for settlement. Authorised representative of the respondent Shri Kaushal stated that the claim of the workman has been fully satisfied and this is the reason that the workman is appearing in the court. So, this reference is dismissed for non-prosecution and answered accordingly. There is no order as to cost.

Dated the 11th February, 1986

B. P. JINDAL,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Rohtak,  
Camp Court, Bahadurgarh.

Endst. No. 150-85/369, dated 10 March, 1986.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

B. P. JINDAL,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Rohtak,  
Camp Court, Bahadurgarh.

No. 9/7/86-6Lab./2453.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Gripo Laboratories inside Avon Scale Company, Industrial Area, Sonapat, Dabwali.

BEFORE SHRI B. P. JINDAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, ROHTAK.

Reference No 206 of 85.

between

SHRIMATI MAMTA. WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. GRIPO  
LABORATORIES INSIDE AVON SCALE COMPANY, INDUSTRIAL AREA,  
SONEPAT.

Present :—

Shri Hawa Singh, A. R. for the workman.

Shri D. C. Gandhi, A. R. for the management.

## AWARD

1. In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute between the workwoman Smt. Mamta and the management of M/s. Gripo Laboratories inside Avon Scale Company, Industrial Area, Sonapat, to this Court, for adjudication,—vide Haryana Government Gazette Notification No. 49323—28, dated 5th December, 1985 :—

Whether the termination of services of Smt. Mamta is justified and in order? If not, to what relief is she entitled ?

2. After receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared. The case of the petitioner is that she was employed with the respondent for the last 1½ years as a Labourer on monthly wages of Rs. 404/- and that the respondent choose to terminate her services unlawfully in flagrant disregard of the provisions of section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

3. The respondent appeared and alleged settlement with the petitioner, whereunder the petitioner has since been reinstated by the respondent. Her authorised representative Shri Hawa Singh has made a statement that the petitioner does not want to prosecute the reference. So, nothing survives for adjudication. The reference is answered and returned accordingly. There is no order as to cost.

Dated 28th February, 1986

B. P. JINDAL,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Rohtak,  
Camp Court, Sonapat.

Endst No. 206-85/370, dated 10th March, 1986

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

B. P. JINDAL,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Rohtak,  
Camp Court, Sonapat.

No. 9/7/86-6Lab./2454.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947, (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Gedore Tools (India) (P) Ltd., Kundli (Sonapat) :—

BEFORE SHRI B. P. JINDAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, ROHTAK

Reference No. 187 of 85

between

SHRI RAM SHANKAR PANDEY, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S.  
GEDORE TOOLS (INDIA) (P) LTD., KUNDLI (SONEPAT)

Present :—

None, for the petitioner.

Shri Ram Phal, Personnel Officer, of the management.

## AWARD

1. In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute, between the workman Shri Ram Shankar Pandey, and the management of M/s Gedore Tools (India) (P) Ltd. Kundli (Sonapat) to this Court, for adjudication,—vide Haryana Government Gazette Notification No. 45346-51, dated 8th November, 1985:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Ram Shankar Pandey, is justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

2. After receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The respondent appeared but the petitioner did not. The case of the petitioner is that he was employed with the respondent as a watchman since 24th June, 1974 on monthly wages of Rs. 745 and that he proceeded on leave from 29th April, 1985 to 25th May, 1985 and when he returned on 30th May, 1985 to resume his duties, he was not allowed to do so and in this way the management has terminated his services in flagrant disregard of the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

3. The respondent has alleged that the petitioner has settled his claim with the respondent. In that behalf a settlement deed dated 18th October, 1985 has been placed on record, which was executed in the presence of Shri Ram Sarup, Deputy Labour Commissioner, Sonapat. Obviously, this is the reason that the petitioner is not appearing in this Court. Under these circumstances, there is no difficulty in holding that the petitioner has settled his claim with the respondent, photo copy of the settlement deed has been placed on record. So, nothing survives for adjudication. The reference is answered and returned accordingly. There is no order as to cost.

B. P. JINDAL,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Rohtak,  
Camp Court, Sonapat.

Dated, the 28th February, 1986.

Endst. No. 187-85/389, dated the 10th March, 1986

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

B. P. JINDAL,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Rohtak,  
Camp Court, Sonapat.

No. 9/8/86-6Lab./2491.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Rajat Industries, Plot No. 251/24, Faridabad.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI R. N. SINGAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,  
FARIDABAD

Reference No. 746 of 1985

between

SHRI MAGGAN LAL WORKMAN AND THE RESPONDENT-MANAGEMENT OF M/S,  
RAJAT INDUSTRIES, PLOT NO. 251/24, FARIDABAD

Present.—

Shri Maggan Lal, workman with Shri Jawahar Lal.

Shri M. K. Bhandari, for the respondent management.

#### AWARD

This industrial dispute between the workman Shri Maggan Lal and the respondent-management of M/s Rajat Industries, Plot No. 251/24, Faridabad, has been referred to this Court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—vide his order No. ID/FD/43073-33, dated 28th November, 1985, under section 10(i) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, for adjudication. The terms of the reference are :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Maggan Lal was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

The workman has settled his disputes with the respondent-management. He has received Rs. 7500.00 in full and final settlement of all his claims. He has no right of reinstatement/re-employment with the management. Hence the award is given that the dispute has been fully settled.

R. N. SINGAL,

Dated, the 28th February, 1985

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Faridabad.

Endst. No. 688, dated 5th March, 1986

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

R. N. SINGAL,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Faridabad.

No. 9/8/86-6Lab/2492.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s H. S. Mechanical Works, IC-69, N.I.T., Faridabad.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI R. N. SINGAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,  
FARIDABAD

Reference No. 185 of 1985

between

SHRI ARUN KUMAR, WORKMAN AND THE RESPONDENT-MANAGEMENT OF  
M/S H. S. MECHANICAL WORKS, IC-69 N.I.T., FARIDABAD

Present :—

Shri Darshan Singh, for the workman.

None, [for the respondent-management.

#### AWARD

This industrial dispute between the workman Shri Arun Kumar and the respondent-management of M/s H. S. Mechanical Works, IC-69, N.I.T., Faridabad has been referred to this Court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—vide his order No. ID/FD/28-85/14102-7, dated 4th April, 1985 under section 10(i)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, for adjudication. The terms of the reference are :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Arun Kumar was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

Shri Darshan Singh pleads no instructions. He states that the workman has not turned up in spite of so many reminders given to him. It shows that the workman is not interested to pursue this reference. Hence the award is given that there is no dispute between the parties.

R. N. SINGAL,

Dated 21st February, 1986

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 689, dated 5th March, 1986

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

R. N. SINGAL,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Faridabad.